

## REMARKS

### *Interview Summary*

Applicants first wish to thank the Examiner and Mr. Peterson for the courteous telephone interview conducted with the undersigned on February 21, 2007. During the interview, the Brown and Rosenkranc references were discussed in the context of the amendments made herein, which were reviewed by the Examiner prior to the interview. The Examiner indicated that the amendment herein would overcome the pending rejections based on Brown, with the possible exception of the combination of Brown and Rosenkranc, applied to claim 86. The Examiner requested that Applicants brief the Examiner on the reasons for patentability over this combination in the present response.

### *Response to Rejections*

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 28, 81-84 and 86 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown. Various claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown combined with Anderson, and in some cases further combined with Parmley or Parmley and Rozenkranc. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made herein overcome these rejections, and believe that the Examiner indicated agreement to this during the interview.

Claim 86 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Brown combined with Rozenkranc. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to modify the Brown razor "by having the trimming blade be oriented in a direction away from the top surface, so that the user would have multiple options when positioning the razor." Applicants respectfully disagree, for several reasons.

First, the Examiner's statement, above, assumes that Brown contemplated including a trimming blade ("...having *the* trimming blade be oriented..."), and that thus the only design factor not addressed by Brown is the placement of the blade. This is simply not the case. Brown does not teach or suggest a blade intended for trimming. In the embodiment focused on by the

Examiner, shown in Fig. 14, Brown shows blades that face in opposite directions. However, all of the blades are intended for shaving; none are meant for trimming hair. The rearward facing blade is provided solely so that the razor will "shave in both directions," as discussed at col. 4, lines 35-39. The razor would not shave in both directions if the rearward facing blade were replaced with a blade on a surface facing away from a surface contacting the user's skin, as proposed by the Examiner. The artisan would not have been motivated to make such a modification, which would have defeated Brown's express purpose with respect to the embodiment shown in Fig. 14.

Second, the Brown razor is optimized for shaving particular areas of the body, e.g., the armpit (axilla) area of female shavers. The razor has a geometry that is specially designed to provide enhanced shaving performance when shaving the axilla and other body areas such as the legs. Assuming *arguendo* that the artisan would have thought there was any reason to modify the Brown razor to include a trimming blade, which is not conceded, the artisan would have been aware that such a modification would change the razor geometry and potentially compromise the very performance attributes that Brown was seeking. Thus, the artisan would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the proposed modification.

In conclusion, absent impermissible hindsight, the artisan would not have been motivated to modify the Brown razor to include a trimming blade of any kind, much less a trimming blade positioned as disclosed in Rozenkranc.

### ***Conclusion***

Allowance is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herein. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-656001.

Applicant : Vincent P. Walker et al.  
Serial No. : 10/799,946  
Filed : March 11, 2004  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 00216-656001 / Case 8126 / Z-  
03359

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2007

/Celia H. Leber/  
Celia H. Leber  
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21523519.doc